

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re *Ex Parte* Reexamination of:)
)
U.S. Patent No. 8,217,902) Control No.: To be assigned
)
Issue Date: July 10, 2012) Group Art Unit: To be assigned
)
Inventor: Ching-Yang Chang et al.) Examiner: To be assigned
)
Application No. 11/842,747) Confirmation No.: To be assigned
)
Filing Date: August 21, 2007)
)
For: CONDUCTOR PATTERN)
STRUCTURE OF CAPACITIVE)
TOUCH PANEL)

Mail Stop *Ex Parte* Reexam
Attn: Central Reexamination Unit
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

REQUEST FOR *EX PARTE* REEXAMINATION OF U.S. PATENT NO. 8,217,902

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	Requirements for <i>Ex Parte</i> Reexaminations Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.510	1
	A. Payment of Fees Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.510(a).....	1
	B. Statement Pointing Out Each Substantial New Question of Patentability Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.510(b)(1).....	1
	C. Identification of Every Claim for Which Reexamination Is Requested and a Detailed Explanation of the Pertinence and Manner of Applying the Prior Art Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.510(b)(2)	1
	D. Copies of Prior Art Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.510(b)(3).....	1
	E. Copy of U.S. Patent No. 8,217,902 Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.510(b)(4).....	1
	F. Certificate of Service Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.510(b)(5)	2
	G. Related Copending Litigation and Reexamination.....	2
	H. Citation of Prior Art Presented	2
III.	Certification That the Statutory Estoppel Provision of 35 U.S.C. § 325(e)(1) Does Not Prohibit Requester from Filing This Request Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.510(b)(6)	3
IV.	Background on the '902 patent.....	3
	A. The '902 patent	3
	B. Prosecution History of the '902 Patent and Reasons for Allowance	7
	1. Applicant's arguments regarding the claimed transparent conductive material limitations.....	7
	2. Applicant's arguments regarding other aspects of the claims at issue.....	10
V.	Statement Pointing Out Each Substantial New Question of Patentability.....	11
	A. Prior Art Reference: Fujitsu.....	13
	B. Prior Art Reference: Binstead.....	17
	C. Prior Art Reference: Bolender	19
	D. Prior Art Reference: Lambert	22

E.	Prior Art Reference: Honeywell	26
F.	Prior Art Reference: Miller	29
VI.	Detailed Explanation Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.510(b)(2).....	31
A.	Fujitsu Anticipates Claims 1-15, 17-22, 24-29, 32, 34-40, 42-44, 46-58, and 60-68 (SNQ No. 1).....	31
B.	Claims 11-15, 17-22, 34, 43, 51, 60, and 67 Are Obvious over Fujitsu in View of Binstead (SNQ No. 2).....	32
1.	Reasons to Combine	32
C.	Claims 16-23, 25-31, 35, 41, 44, 45, and 68 Are Obvious over Fujitsu in View of Honeywell (SNQ No. 3)	33
1.	Reasons to Combine	33
D.	Claims 33 and 59 Are Obvious over Fujitsu in View of Bolender (SNQ No. 4)	35
1.	Reasons to Combine	35
E.	Claims 17-22, 25-29, 35, 44, and 68 Are Obvious over Fujitsu in View of Miller (SNQ No. 5).....	36
1.	Reasons to Combine	36
F.	Binstead Anticipates Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-13, 15, 17-19, 21, 22, 24-27, 29, 32, 34-37, 39, 40, 42-44, 46-48, 50-55, 57, 58, 60-62, and 64-68 (SNQ No. 6).....	38
G.	Claims 4, 9, 14, 16-23, 25-30, 35, 38, 41, 44, 45, 49, 56, 63, and 68 Are Obvious over Binstead in View of Honeywell (SNQ No. 7).....	38
1.	Reasons to Combine	39
H.	Claims 33 and 59 Are Obvious over Binstead in View of Bolender (SNQ No. 8)	40
1.	Reasons to Combine	40
I.	Claims 17-19, 21, 22, 25-27, 29, 35, 44, and 68 Are Obvious over Binstead in View of Miller (SNQ No. 9).....	41
1.	Reasons to Combine	41

J.	Lambert Anticipates Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-14, 17-20, 22, 24-28, 32, 34-38, 40, 42-44, 46-49, 51-56, 58, 60-63, and 65-68 (SNQ No. 10).....	43
K.	Claims 5, 10, 15, 21, 29, 39, 50, 57, and 64 Are Obvious over Lambert in View of Binstead (SNQ No. 11).....	43
	1. Reasons to Combine	44
L.	Claims 16-20, 22, 23, 25-28, 30, 31, 35, 41, 44, 45, and 68 Are Obvious over Lambert in View of Honeywell (SNQ No. 12).....	45
	1. Reasons to Combine	45
M.	Claims 33 and 59 Are Obvious over Lambert in View of Bolender (SNQ No. 13)	46
	1. Reasons to Combine	46
N.	Claims 17-20, 22, 25-28, 35, 44, and 68 Are Obvious over Lambert in View of Miller (SNQ No. 14).....	48
	1. Reasons to Combine	48
O.	Honeywell Anticipates Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-14, 16-20, 22-28, 30-32, 34-38, 40-49, 51-56, 58, 60-63, and 65-68 (SNQ No. 15).....	49
P.	Claims 5, 10-24, 29, 34, 39, 43, 40, 50-52, 57, 60, 64, 65, and 67 Are Obvious over Honeywell in View of Binstead (SNQ No. 16).....	50
	1. Reasons to Combine	50
Q.	Claims 33 and 59 Are Obvious over Honeywell in View of Bolender (SNQ No. 17).....	51
	1. Reasons to Combine	51
R.	Claims 17-20, 22, 23, 25-28, 30, 35, 44, and 68 Are Obvious over Honeywell in View of Miller (SNQ No. 18)	53
	1. Reasons to Combine	53
VII.	Conclusion	54

TABLE OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit 1:	U.S. Patent No. 8,217,902 (“the ’902 patent”)
Exhibit 2:	Prosecution History of the ’902 Patent
Exhibit 3:	Certificate of Translation by Tadashige Itoh regarding JP 61-84729 to Honeywell (“Honeywell”)
Exhibit 4:	Certificate of Translation by Tadashige Itoh regarding JP 60-75927 to Fujitsu (“Fujitsu”)
Exhibit PA1:	Japanese Published Patent Application No. 60-75927 (“Fujitsu”) and corresponding English translation of the JP 75927 application (including Abstract)
Exhibit PA2:	U.S. Patent No. 6,137,427 to Ronald Binstead (“Binstead”)
Exhibit PA3:	U.S. Patent Application Publication 2005/0030048 to Robert Bolender et al. (“Bolender”)
Exhibit PA4:	Published UK Patent Application GB 2 168 816 A to Andrew Lambert (“Lambert”)
Exhibit PA5:	Japanese Published Patent Application No. 61-84729 (“Honeywell”) and corresponding English translation of the JP 84729 application (including Abstract)
Exhibit PA6:	U.S. Patent No. 5,374,787 to Robert Miller et al. (“Miller”)
Exhibit CC1:	Claim Chart based on Fujitsu with additional references to Binstead, Honeywell, Bolender, and Miller
Exhibit CC2:	Claim Chart based on Binstead with additional references to Honeywell, Bolender, and Miller
Exhibit CC3:	Claim Chart based on Lambert with additional references to Binstead, Honeywell, Bolender, and Miller
Exhibit CC4:	Claim Chart based on Honeywell with additional references to Binstead, Bolender, and Miller

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.